



# The Nine Lives of the Episcopal Cat: changing self-images of the Scottish Episcopal Church

Rev. GAVIN D. WHITE, B.A., B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D.

## *Presidential Address*

The subject of this contribution is the ability of a church to survive even though its defining characteristics change and, indeed, change radically. And this may be more easily seen in the Episcopal church which was, and is, living precariously in cracks of the wall rather than marching as an army with banners. If it resembled a cat with nine lives, or the minister's cat with a veritable alphabet of characteristics, this was essential for its continued existence.

The first life was that of support for the Stuarts. It is easy to argue that Episcopalians had to support the Stuarts as only the Stuarts would support episcopacy. Yet there was more to it than that. Continued Episcopalian support for the Stuarts did not guarantee support from the Stuarts. A Stuart restoration would have meant, sooner or later, a Roman Catholic regime which ground them as surely as did the Presbyterian. But at the back of continued Jacobite sentiment, which lingered long after Jacobite conviction, was something theological. Kings are given to us, and we do not choose them for their utility. If God sends us bad ones, we are to endure them. There can be no social contract with a monarch. Life is not like that. And this devotion to "givenness" was to outlast the Jacobite cause. Yet the possibility of a Stuart restoration strongly influenced the self-image of Episcopalians. While it remained, Episcopalians could see themselves as a party of the Church of Scotland who were only awaiting another turn of the wheel. After the 1719 rising this seemed less likely; after the 1745 rising most Episcopalians realised that it would never occur.

This was to their benefit. They had had a full half-century in which to discover how to live in opposition, and now they could cease to be a party in the Church of Scotland and become a church in Scotland. And the state would become increasingly less hostile. Episcopalians might not be popular, but that was for their past history. They were no longer to be considered a danger, and during the

following half-century random persecution, whether by mob or by government, would give way to toleration. As for the persecution, this took place for a variety of reasons. Usually it was for disloyalty and to bring an end to the very real threat of future rebellions. Sometimes it was for bringing down on Scotland English armies and disabilities. Sometimes it was for threatening invasion by French armies with all that that implied. But the Episcopalians were also harassed for their Englishness; when an Episcopal minister was rabbled out of Glasgow it was for “audaciously” reading the burial service over the grave of an English soldier. But since the causes of persecution were varied, it was hardly surprising that the response of Episcopalians was varied.<sup>1</sup>

Many, probably most, and certainly most in the towns and cities, ditched the Jacobite cause altogether. They could not continue as they had been; it is possible that few of them even wanted to continue as they had been. Rural congregations in remote areas protected by great landowners might evade the law, particularly where most of the population were Episcopalian. But were the Episcopal congregations which continued to be Jacobite so protected by landlords that they could be Jacobite, or were they forced to be Jacobite when they would rather have slipped out of this obligation? The answer to this is not clear, and it is probably a mixture of the two. At any rate it was almost impossible to be Jacobite in the towns. There the only answer was to qualify under the Act of Toleration of 1712, which had been intended to neutralise the Episcopalians of that day by detaching them from their Jacobite convictions, and which now achieved the same end after the 1745 rising. This meant clergy “qualifying” by swearing loyalty to the Hanoverian line, it meant congregations praying for those monarchs in church, it meant using the Book of Common Prayer while the Jacobites continued the Presbyterian traditions of worship, and after the 1745 it meant that only clergy ordained by English or Irish bishops could minister in such chapels.

The Scottish bishops naturally cried “schism” and argued that English and Irish bishops were intruding into Scottish dioceses. In fact, these chapels depended on the goodwill of local law officers, and of English and Irish bishops. They received assistance from both. The

---

<sup>1</sup> *Scottish Guardian*, 18.10.1901, 664; 25.12.1931, 814.

law officers wanted to bring outlaws within the law, and many of the Episcopal laity in the towns were wealthy and influential. But there are indications that the Church of England was more concerned for the lost Episcopalians of Scotland than historians have been willing to concede. The historians of the Scottish Episcopal Church have been drawn from the high church tradition, and their view of the eighteenth-century Church of England has been negative. All their sympathies have been for the Scottish bishops and the suffering remnant who stood for that spiritual independence which was the hallmark of the nineteenth-century high churchman in England, as it was of the non-intrusionist in Scotland. The qualified chapels have been dismissed as Erastian, which they were not. The Erastian principle would have had everyone adhering to the establishment, which was Presbyterian, and not to an Episcopal chapel, whether qualified or not. And no English bishop ministered in Scotland. Two bishops of Irish dioceses administered confirmation and ordained in qualified chapels, and a Bishop of Sodor and Man, who was not quite of the Church of England and was historically half-Scottish, confirmed in Edinburgh in the last days before the union of qualified and Scottish Episcopalians. The impression given is that the Scottish bishops were not so much ignored as quietly nudged in a certain direction.<sup>2</sup>

Three examples may be given. In Edinburgh there were at least thirteen Episcopal meeting houses before the 1745 rising, and it is not clear how many of these were qualified. One of these went back to 1702 or 1708, and met in Half-Moon Close, and then in 1722 as the New Chapel at the foot of Blackfriars Wynd with the more common title of Baron Smith's Chapel. He had been a certain John Smith who came to Scotland as Lord Chief Baron of the new Court of Exchequer and who, with other English officials, wanted Prayer Book services. (If the one Scottish gain of the Act of Union was to have England conform to the Scottish New Year, this did not apply to the payment

---

<sup>2</sup> *Journal of the Episcopal Visitations of the Right Rev. Robert Forbes*, ed. J.B. Craven (London, 1886), 162; J. Wilkinson, *Some Chapters of Church History in Buchan* (Peterhead, 1914), 86; Scottish Episcopal Church Archives, 2224 (a) 4 Jan. 1791, Bishop of Edinburgh to Bishop of Sodor and Man; M. Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland in the 19th Century* (London, 1966), 37.

of taxes, nor does it now.) But the name of John Smith guaranteed loyalty to Queen Anne, not to mention financial rectitude. The chapel was “English” but when the pretender came to Edinburgh in 1745, the minister, a Mr Fowlis from Essex, prayed for the king without naming him, for which he was dismissed – though not until after the Pretender had withdrawn. The chapel managers were being as circumspect as he had been. When this chapel joined with two others to form the Cowgate Chapel in 1777, it was opened by the Commander of the Forces in North Britain, and inscribed, “Aedificii Sacr. Ecclesiae Episc. Angliae”, which was about as English as could be had. And yet what lists of office holders survive from such chapels are overwhelmingly of Scottish surnames, just as their clergy, ordained in England or Ireland, were mainly Scottish.<sup>3</sup>

In Glasgow nine “disconsolate sons of the Church of England” petitioned the Archbishop of York for a clergyman; eight of the nine were actually Scots. In 1750 they built St Andrew’s-by-the-Green, and legend had it that the soldiers of the future hero of Quebec, Major Wolfe, were employed in the work, and that Wolfe himself worshipped there. Whether true or not, the legend was to be useful as Wolfe had defeated the French with whom the Jacobites had been allied, and this distinguished the congregation from all rebels. And yet there remained smaller congregations of Episcopalians in both Edinburgh and Glasgow which never qualified by law. If they moved from one hired room to another, their whereabouts can hardly have been secret. Whether the existence of large qualified chapels satisfied the authorities, or whether it was hoped these would gradually eliminate the smaller ones, is not clear.<sup>4</sup>

Peterhead was an Episcopalian centre, where the chapel was demolished after the 1745 rising. But in 1770 Bishop Kilgour, who ministered there, appointed a strong Jacobite to a neighbouring church which the authorities then closed. This antagonised most of his Peterhead laity who had another man ordained by Bishop Traill of

---

<sup>3</sup> *Scottish Guardian*, 17.7.1891, 349-51; 6.1.1933, 2; 13.1.1933, 18; 20.1.1933, 34; T. Veitch, *Story of St Paul’s and St George’s Church, York Place* (Edinburgh, n.d.).

<sup>4</sup> *Scottish Guardian*, 1.6.1871, 14; *Scottish Chronicle*, 27.11.1925, 810; J.T. Findlay, *Wolfe in Scotland* (London, 1928), 164-6.



Down and Connor in 1771, thereby dividing the congregation. But if anyone was putting politics above religion it was Kilgour, who had advanced his Jacobite politics to the detriment of the church. As for Traill, he was the son of a Church of Scotland minister who had himself favoured Episcopalians in his time, and Traill was certainly not advancing any notions of establishment, whether Scottish, English, or Irish.<sup>5</sup>

After the Scottish Episcopal Church accepted the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England in 1804 and prayed for the reigning monarch, the qualified chapels placed themselves under the Scottish bishops so rapidly that a degree of persuasion from south of the Border is suggested. And when one chapel became involved in litigation over the move, the entire bench of English bishops contributed to their costs. But the union of the two traditions was not a swallowing of the qualified chapels by the former Jacobites. It was more that of an heiress of vulgar birth marrying an impoverished aristocrat and gaining a title in return for a secure future. That life of the cat was over, but it had been well lived.<sup>6</sup>

But there remains one question. Why were these chapels popular? They had abandoned the Jacobite cause, they were Episcopalians who had abandoned the only episcopate in Scotland, and yet they prospered. The first thing which must be said is that their status was no different from that of Episcopal congregations both in America and in the later colonies, which had no bishops. They were not as idiosyncratic as they seem to us today. The second thing is that they had Prayer Book services which were making rapid progress even in Jacobite circles throughout the eighteenth century. And the third thing is that they were not Calvinist, though it may be argued that preaching in the Athens of the North was very far from Calvinism through much of that century.

But parallel to them, and a quite separate life, was that of the continuing Scottish Episcopalians, inheritors of the Jacobite tradition and, like an ecclesiastical Dounreay reprocessing dangerous wastes,

---

<sup>5</sup> Wilkinson, *Church History in Buchan*, 83-6; J.T. Hornsby, "The Case of Mr John Glas", *ante*, vi (1938), 117.

<sup>6</sup> F.C. Mather, *High Church Prophet: Bishop Samuel Horsley (1733-1806) and the Caroline Tradition in the Late Georgian Church* (Oxford, 1992), 137.

turning that into something less lethal. They became Hutchinsonians as did so many of the old High Church Tories of the Church of England. If the teachings of John Hutchinson were a rich gallimaufry of improbabilities and incredibilities, there was in them a solid strain which could be used to reprocess Jacobitism. This was a doctrine of direct action by God, with divinely given institutions, and an Old Testament which directly taught the doctrines of the New. As for the place which formerly was given to the monarchy, this now went to the sacraments, which loomed large in their devotion even if very rarely celebrated. Again, if Newtonian physics was scorned this was because it worked by laws which seemed to place God at a distance. God did not need laws, and he did not need a power-transmission or a gearbox; he worked directly. And in the late version of Hutchinsonianism which gripped John Skinner in prison in 1753, there was a counter to the prevailing deist threat of those times. If most churchmen of that era tended to put the three persons of the Trinity at too great a distance from each other, the Hutchinsonians moved them so close together as to be virtually Sabellians, and by separating the two natures of Christ they were virtually Nestorian, though of this they were blissfully unaware. But the timing was critical. Church of Scotland thinkers had dabbled in this faith but had done so a generation before, and it had left no discernable trace in their ranks. Episcopalians followed Skinner into this way of thought at a time when it was being revived in the Church of England, for the quite fantastical reason that it was thought to be a defence against a flood of Jewish immigrants. And by so doing, Episcopalians found themselves close to a small group of English high churchmen who were to serve them well in seeking repeal of the Penal Acts. Furthermore, if it seemed that Hutchinsonianism was to disappear without trace, and nobody was later moved to claim such a heritage, it left a tradition of history – Episcopalians well into this century have written history in vast quantities, good history or bad history, and nothing but history. God is in history, and that is that.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 127; G. White, "Hutchinsonianism in Eighteenth-Century Scotland", *ante*, xxi, pt.2 (1982); W. Walker, *The Life and Times of the Rev. John Skinner, M.A., of Linhart, Longside, Dean of Aberdeen* (London, 1883), 133.

A fourth life concerns Calvinism. Throughout the nineteenth century the dominant view was optimistic with regard to both humanity and the world, and Calvinism was in retreat. Nineteenth-century Episcopalians, whose knowledge of Calvinism was minimal, assumed that as Calvinism declined, those churches which adhered to the Westminster Confession would decline, and Episcopalians would fill the resulting vacuum. And long after predestination had faded from the practical faith of the Presbyterian churches, it was assumed by Episcopalians to be an integral part of the national creed. As late as 1931 there was a reference in the Episcopal press to "the popular Calvinism that has hung like a pall over Scottish religion for more than three centuries". Against this, in 1924 there was a comment to the effect that "the Scottish people are gradually losing their old national characteristics", and "they are learning to be glad". But in fact the matter had been settled long before that. Calvinism in the Church of Scotland had been challenged in the 1830s, and had gradually declined thereafter, though this was only publicly acknowledged at the time of the Moody revival, and adherence to the Westminster Confession only formally modified in the later decades of that century. But there was a concerted campaign against Calvinism by Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, by his associate Alexander Ewing, the somewhat muddily liberal Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, and by others, in the middle of the century. But they did not foresee that churches supposedly built on Calvinism could quite easily move to something else and thus leave Episcopalians grappling with nothing but thin air.<sup>8</sup>

Nor were Episcopalians the only ones to lose this supposed advantage. The Mormon Church, whatever it may have become since, began in the Burned Over District of Upstate New York where Calvinist New Englanders migrated west past the Alleghanies and along the Erie Canal, becoming caught up in Arminian Evangelicalism as they did so. The main brand, that of Charles Finney, is the distinctive form of American Evangelicalism to this

---

<sup>8</sup> *Scottish Chronicle* 26.9.1924, 631; *Scottish Guardian*, 3.4.1931, 207; A.J. Ross, *Memoir of Alexander Ewing, DCL, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles* (London, 1877), 265, 355; D. Finlayson, "Aspects of the Life and Influence of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen 1788-1870", *ante*, xx, pt.1 (1978), 35, 37.



day. But along the Finger Lakes the Mormons promoted an Arminianism which not only extended salvation to all those alive but even to their ancestors. It was an extreme repudiation of Calvinism, and like the Episcopalian and perhaps most counter-Calvinist movements it was hierarchical, communitarian, and obsessed with its history. But it was natural that it should send missionaries to Scotland, the only other country which was still formally Calvinist, where they landed in 1839 and were initially successful. Over 9000 Scots became converts, but after the 1850s the momentum was lost, and not just because 3000 migrated to Utah. A movement devoted to converting Calvinists could not live without Calvinists, and its pool of potential converts was drying up.<sup>9</sup>

But there was a sense in which the Episcopal Church was not so much opposing Calvinism as re-processing it. There is a sentence in Drummond and Bulloch's first volume in which the eastern tradition of the church-state is attributed to Episcopalians, while the western Hildebrandian tradition is attributed to Presbyterians. This is probably true at one level, and yet the Episcopal and the Calvinist traditions both link church and state, at least in the ideal, though the Episcopal puts the king at the centre as a sort of high priest, and the Calvinist puts him under the authority of the consistory. But that God is "Lord of nations as well as Lord of Saints" is essential, and that brings God close to the creation, and close to society, in a sense that a more distant God is not. Divine right of kings concerned the sovereignty of God, even if it anchored it too firmly in the mud, and Hutchinsonianism asserted the direct rule of God without intervening laws. In all this there was a dance in which people moved far from their starting-point and yet never quite left it.<sup>10</sup>

If that was the fourth life of the cat, the fifth was anglicisation, which was not the same thing as anglicanisation. This may be seen in the writings of Dean Ramsay of Edinburgh, who was so accustomed to use the word "English" to include the Scots that he needed a word

---

<sup>9</sup> W.R. Cross, *The Burned Over District: the Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York 1800-1850* (Ithaca, 1950); B. Aspinwall, *Portable Utopia: Glasgow and the United States 1820-1920* (Aberdeen, 1984), 26-7.

<sup>10</sup> A.L. Drummond and J. Bulloch, *The Scottish Church 1688-1843: The Age of the Moderates* (Edinburgh, 1973), 9.

to describe those English who were not Scottish. The word he found was Latin, an equivalent to Caledonian, and so he wrote of Anglican land tenure and even of an Anglican Wesleyan Methodist. For the rest, it was taken for granted that anglicisation would continue. In 1879 it was claimed that the process of anglicisation had only really done its work in the larger centres, so that the Episcopal Church would still have to have Scottish clergy for rural areas until, presumably, all of Scotland was anglicised and there need be no Scottish clergy. There would be English clergy, and English church architecture, and the English social system, and of course English English. And this programme was undertaken with bishops newly selected from the Church of England, with clergy for the major congregations in Edinburgh and Glasgow newly selected from the Church of England, and with theological ideas newly selected from the Church of England. Scottish clergy, despite Oxford Movement attempts to have them trained, first at an English public school in Perthshire and then on an island in the Firth of Clyde, were produced by a theological college in Edinburgh usually, but not always, staffed by clergy from Oxford or Cambridge. There was, however, some doubt as to whether anglicisation had succeeded. It had not succeeded according to the Episcopal press in 1934 which casually attributed to the Scottish people a "humiliating backwardness in culture and spiritual perception". Of course the assumption that anglicisation would triumph irritated the Scottish element in the Episcopal Church, and their discontent erupted periodically. This led to soothing words from the English leaders and hopes that one day Scots would be ready to take the lead and be provosts of cathedrals and bishops of dioceses, and in the meanwhile it would be unfair to burden them with responsibilities for which they were not ready. At the same time they were reassured by the numbers of Scots, or men with Scottish surnames, who were bishops or deans in England or in the wider empire, though how these came to be ready for responsibility, when Scots in Scotland were not ready, was not explained. And many of the Oxford or Cambridge men brought into the Episcopal church as bishops were born in Scotland or had Scottish ancestors. But sometimes the connection was remote, and not unlike the story of the London young man about town who was given a commission in the

Scots Guards in the First World War when he told the board he had some property in Scotland. He did not tell them it was a suit of clothes sent to Perth for dry cleaning.<sup>11</sup>

But the whole process of anglicisation needs to be studied. To begin with, it followed a century in which “Scotch knowledge” had transformed England, and without Scottish professionalism it may even be doubted if England would have been able to influence anyone. And if England did influence Scotland, this was much in the way England influenced the colonial empire, which under an English skin was increasingly Scottish. Bishop Forbes of Brechin alarmed his fellow-bishops with a charge to his clergy in 1857 which set forth views on the eucharistic real presence which were intended to support Dr Pusey in Oxford, but the only part of it which would interest anyone today is on quite another subject. “Politically, we find that in the Providence of God one dominant race from time to time leaves its mark on history, the present imperial race in the whole world is the one which holds the faith of the Church of England in its widest sense....” But it did not work out in that way. When English settlers went to distant lands they usually found that the Scots had already set up banks and businesses and newspapers and political parties and even churches. Attempts to impose Anglicanism as an established religion were unpopular and unsuccessful, and Anglican churches overseas were demanding to be independent of the Church of England as well as of the state.<sup>12</sup>

But if Scottish Episcopalians assumed that anglicisation would benefit them, they were to be proved right in the short term but wrong in the long term. The process of anglicisation, which was really modernisation as Americanism is today, could be and was pushed forward by the Presbyterian churches even while Episcopalians believed that they held a monopoly on it. As with Calvinism, they were not aware that the existing institutions could and would change

---

<sup>11</sup> E.B. Ramsay, *Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character* (London, 1883), 19, 23, 37; *Scottish Guardian* 4.7.1879, 321; 22.9.1933, 600; 26.1.1934, 59; E. Luscombe, *A Seminary of Learning: Edinburgh Theological College, 1810-1994* (Edinburgh, 1994).

<sup>12</sup> A.C. Chitnis, *The Scottish Enlightenment and Early Victorian English Society* (London, 1986), 184; A.P. Forbes, *A Primary Charge* (Edinburgh, 1858), 61.

even while insisting on their antiquity. And they assumed that they held a monopoly on liturgical worship. Admittedly changes in worship in Scottish churches were not as apparent as they were in England, but they were just as significant and just as universal.

But, and this is a sixth life, there were the self-styled “English Episcopalians”. These were a group of chapels which grew up in the 1840s, ostensibly as a protest against the new ideas of the Oxford Movement on the one hand, and the sacramental theology of the Scottish eucharistic liturgy on the other. There were three main centres, St Paul’s in Aberdeen, St Thomas’ in Edinburgh, and St Jude’s in Glasgow. St Paul’s had a long history as a qualified chapel which had joined the Episcopal church and almost immediately backed out over what now appear to be trifles; the minister, Sir William Dunbar, seems to have been an innocent victim of a cabal on his vestry, though a minimum of good sense in Bishop William Skinner might have avoided the whole thing. D.K.T. Drummond in Edinburgh withdrew because he was forbidden to evangelise in Aberdeenshire, and the bishops had passed new rules forbidding impromptu services anywhere; once again, Skinner appears to have been responsible for this heavy-handedness. And C.P. Miles in Glasgow withdrew because he was forbidden to support Dunbar. Each of the three responded in different ways. Dunbar sued Skinner for defamation, Drummond produced a learned theory that Scottish bishops could not be bishops without parliamentary approval, Miles rumbled on about “trafficking in souls” and ended, “I tremble for England”. For a while it looked as if something might come of this movement which was more English than even the Scottish Episcopal Church at its most servile, since the 1850s were years of agitation against “Papal Aggression” by Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister, who linked that to the Oxford Movement. Furthermore, the Scottish Episcopal Church did have a liturgy, though only used in the north, which was not quite that of the Book of Common Prayer. It was easy to argue that good Church of England people in Scotland should adhere to chapels which had no truck with such things, and which were firmly English. Since what has survived of this group has been firmly Evangelical it is customary to regard it as always having been such, but in fact it was more establishment than anything else. It



wanted an Anglicanism in Scotland which was fully established; if it called itself the United Church of England and Ireland in Scotland, that was how it saw itself. That it failed was not just because its leaders were, in different ways, troublesome, but because there were limits to anglicisation. And it failed because the Scottish Episcopal Church reacted by downgrading the Scottish Liturgy and reprimanding Bishop Forbes and his like for being too openly in favour of the Oxford Movement. But if Scotland had really gone all the way into oblivion and ended up as another Cumberland, the English Episcopalians might have found their imaginary world made real.<sup>13</sup>

A seventh life, which never had much chance of success, may be summed up in a phrase used in 1929 when the Church of Scotland united with the United Free Church. The phrase was, “completing the triangle”, in a union to undo the division of 1690. That there were relatively few who looked to this outcome was probably due to the expectation of completely replacing the Presbyterian establishment without making concessions to it. “The history of the Established Presbyterian Church is a thing almost of yesterday – a thing that passed under the eyes of the grandfathers or great-grandfathers of men still alive.” These words appeared in the *Scottish Guardian* of 1879, and it was possible, even then, to believe that after so many changes in Scottish church life, the last one might not prove to be permanent. But there was also the belief that Presbyterianism was tied to Calvinism, as already noted, and there was the belief that Presbyterianism was dividing and would divide further until only fragments remained. And there was the belief that Presbyterians were, or would inevitably become, Unitarian. This was rooted in the experience of English Presbyterians becoming Unitarians in the eighteenth century, though later misunderstandings of continental

---

<sup>13</sup> D.K.T. Drummond, *Historical Sketch of Episcopacy in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1845), 24-33; C.P. Miles, *The Scottish Episcopal Church antagonistic to the Church of England in Scotland* (Glasgow, 1857); C.P. Miles, *An Address to the Members of St Jude's Congregation, Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1844), 32-33; C.P. Miles, *A Third Address to the Members of St. Jude's Congregation, Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1844), 47; *Revised Report of the Debate in the House of Lords, May 22 1849, On the Occasion of the Right Hon. the Lord Brongham presenting a Petition from members of the United Church of England and Ireland resident in Scotland...* (London, 1849).

theology reinforced it. And, of course, there was the idea that Presbyterianism was tied to a Scottish culture which was doomed to disappear. Presbyterianism would disappear with it, and Episcopalians would replace it.<sup>14</sup>

But it did not work out in that fashion. Scottish culture did not disappear, Presbyterianism did not disappear, the Presbyterian churches did not fragment but began to unite, and that more “Scottish” element in the Episcopal church which had always looked for some sort of reunion was strengthened. As early as 1864 the liturgical innovations of Dr Robert Lee were greeted with favour, “It is a movement in the right direction. We should recognise it and hail it with sympathy and encouragement. Instead of meeting it with abuse...”. After the 1900 union it was Professor James Cooper who attracted Anglicans with his lectures in the crypt of St Paul’s Cathedral, London. If some Anglicans innocently assumed that he was typical of the Church of Scotland most were probably aware that he was not, but his very presence in that body showed it had something with which they could sympathise. But Episcopalians who put too much faith in men like Cooper were doomed to disappointment. The 1907 diaries of Dean Farquhar show that worthy gentleman’s disquiet as he noted that in the General Assembly only fifteen supported Cooper in his bid to have Episcopalians included in a future union. And Farquhar noted that in a union of the Church of Scotland with the united Frees, “we shall be totally eclipsed”, though it would “work out for good” in itself. There was concern that when the union took place and the Moderator and the Archbishop of Canterbury asked for “the further inclusion” of Episcopalians, there was “but a partial and hesitating response”. And after the union occurred, a woman wrote that before that the Episcopalians had been one church amongst many, but were now like a small dog barking at a mastiff.<sup>15</sup>

But those who looked to the triangle were never as strong as those who followed the eighth life, that of a province in the Anglican

---

<sup>14</sup> *Scottish Guardian*, 4.7.1879, 327; 22.7.1902, 470; 22.1.1943, 3; *Scottish Chronicle*, 4.10.1929, 660; 11.10.1929, 671.

<sup>15</sup> *Scottish Guardian*, Aug. 1864, 313; *Scottish Chronicle*, 11.10.1929, 677; Dean Farquhar’s Diaries, 4.6.1907; 4.6.1909; J. Cooper, *Reunion: A Voice from Scotland* (London, 1918), 63-107.

Communion. When Episcopalians began their separate existence there was no such thing, but once they had established a relationship with the Church of England they could adopt the status of the emerging colonial churches. And as the achievement of a major place in Scottish life became more remote, being part of the Anglican Communion was an acceptable alternative. Furthermore, they could argue that they were an influential part of the Anglican Communion, since, if the Scottish bishops had not consecrated Samuel Seabury as a bishop for America in 1784, there would have been no Episcopal church in that country and, by inference, no Anglican Communion. Of course the facts were not quite that simple; Seabury was a Loyalist secretly selected by other Loyalist clergy, and the bishops who really mattered in America were those openly elected in America and consecrated in London a few years later. But the legend of Seabury's consecration in Aberdeen helped endear the Scottish Episcopalians to English high churchmen for whom bishops were everything, and freedom from the state was everything.<sup>16</sup>

The key date for the claims of the Anglican Communion was 1890 when the General Synod renamed itself the Provincial Synod (it has since gone back on this, but that is another story) and by implication put Scotland alongside Canterbury and York. There was a suggestion that the presiding bishop or Primus should be called an archbishop, but that was going too far. It was not until 1893 that Canadian bishops presiding over provinces were called archbishops, and when the Archbishop of Canterbury was informed on "a half sheet of foreign notepaper", he said "lightly done" and refused to acknowledge the title, though that made no difference in Canada. But a more subtle recognition of the new status was the spread of cathedrals. Previously these had only been where an ancient cathedral did not exist, and the ancient cathedrals were expected eventually to return to Episcopacy. Now they were written off, and if no obvious cathedral existed in a diocese then a church was so designated.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> G. White, "The Consecration of Bishop Seabury", *Scottish Historical Review*, lxiii, 1, no.175 (April, 1984), 37-49.

<sup>17</sup> *Scottish Guardian*, 6.6.1890, 323, 334, 338; A.C. Benson, *The Life of Edward White Benson* (London, 1899), 473-4.

That life has been a fairly long one, but it has perhaps had its day. The decline of Britain has meant that the Church of England plays a less prominent part in the Anglican Communion than it once did, and the dependence of the Scottish Episcopal Church on the Church of England is no longer paralleled in other countries. Indeed, it is declining in Scotland; the idea of a bishop being chosen straight out of England is not dead, but nearly so. The Anglican Communion will no doubt survive, but not as it was.

And so to the ninth life, in which Scotland becomes more Scottish, and England is just another country in Europe. There have been somewhat unrealistic expectations of an alliance with Lutheranism, and if the emphasis is more on Europe than it was, there will probably be attempts to find a place in the new Scotland. But the ninth life is still being developed, and we cannot see it in focus. What we can see is a succession of self-images which have served their time against a changing backdrop of national identity, a changing national church, and a changing world. All churches have to adjust their sails to the prevailing winds or, in our own times, the prevailing calms, but small churches have to be more nimble as they make these adjustments. The Scottish Episcopal Church is still doing so. And yet there is also continuity. However independent of the Church of Scotland the Episcopalians may have been, there has always been an awareness that it is against that backdrop that they exist, and this is probably a constant factor. And if there has normally been a devotion to history and to givenness, that is also a characteristic of Scottish life, and of the Church of Scotland.

*St Andrews*